Mr N So, you all braved the rain, huh, and the storm? Maybe there is an ambition. Did we leave anything last time that, you might say, was unsaid? Or anyone...(the doorbell rings)...no. Can we stretch a point? (the bell rings again)...There, you see? Where is conscience? No, we are going ahead. Now, who's the culprit? Were you here last week? Who came in? Were you here last week?

Q-A No.

Mr N See, that's always the trouble, isn't it? We start at eight; and the door will be locked from now on. So now, what was left; I mean by that did anyone last week have a question that there was no time for, and would like to be number one now. Yes? No, there was someone that was (?). Yes, and I said no, that was your fault, because you put up your hand when I said who's new, and you had been here before. All right. Good. Let's have the question.

Martha Albert:

Q-B What is conscience and how does one reach it and what would it be like to have it?

Mr N Have you got a conscience now?

Q-B Well, I have something or other that changes, but I don't know if that's conscience.

Mr N Well, it may change, but is it something that you might call the beginning of a conscience?

Q-B Well, I think so.

Mr N Yes. I think we have a conscience of a certain kind. And I think it is not very strong. I don't know really how it is formed because I think it is different for different people. It is a certain judgement. That is, I start, whenever I want to do

Must Remain in Transcription Room

certain things, even want to think, or allow myself to feel, to judge if it is right or wrong. I have an idea about what is right for me and what is wrong for me; it doesn't mean that it is an absolute right, and it surely doesn't mean that it is an objective right, but that which I call right or wrong in the way we live in this present world is determined to a great extent by what we call our civilisation. And each person, depending on where he has been born, the civilzation in which he lives, or the particular culture that he has received, whatever he has experienced, what has made a person what he is, of course, has a certain set of rules for himself. Sometimes he calls them ethical, sometimes he will call them in accordance with certain laws in which he believes, and sometimes it is simply determined for him by the general society that which is right and wrong, what one should or should not do, and when it becomes dangerous for the existence of the rest of society, it is called criminal. So the conscience is a variable something, but at times it is quite definitely something in me that says I will be allowed to do it, or I will allow myself to do certain things, or even have a thought about it, and at other times, I will say no, that doesn't belong to me.Now, how it is made, that is another question; I think it belongs to a person who considers himself with the different values of how he has been affected by his education or by the surrounding or by different people or by the different kinds of relationships that he has with other people. I think there is something of a different quality in one that is perhaps not always defineable, and most likely it has to do with what one feels; now if there is a differnece between the feeling and that which I think, then of course there is some kind of a fight

between the two, and sometimes one wins, and sometimes the other, so I don't think the conscience is really very strong at times when it is a little bit doubtful, so that I myself don't know what is right and what is wrong. In such a case, I go to someone and ask him, and when he says, and I have belief in such a person, I say all right, you say so, therefore I will do it. So I think it is quite flexible, because that which I think and you think and someone else thinks may not be the same; and it may depend on how you have been educated and what kind of ideas I have and have been implanted in me, and every person has a certain generalization about what is right and what is wrong for them, and if one tries to talk about it, I think one has trouble in establishing a language that is more or less uniform, and can be understood by different people, because the concept you have of certain ethical values may not be ethical for someone else. And the strictness in one's life, particularly when one has been influenced by religious thoughts or teachers, or certain communities in which certain things were allowed or not allowed, and where, if you went against them, there was a certain dissent, and usually fear implanted in one because you should not do that, already from a very early age we are taught that kind of a way of how we should behave. When children are still very young and they do something that is not quite right, we say Oh, we don't do that in our family. You see? Or if you want to grow up, you have to be able to be a regular young little man, and you become a Lord Fauntleroy and everything. So when a person starts to grow up, and he has a certain set of ideas, partly (?), partly on the basis of morality, and with that he goes into the world, and he experiences different things, and then he starts to live

in accordance with his so-called conscience, this set of rules that he has made for himself. Now I can say that partly, that which he considers rules for himself may be his traits of character, may be certain principles, and may be a certain understanding of what he is as a human being, and whatever he might be as a human being, what he knows about himself, may have been a result of whatever his knowledge is including, let's say, astrology, so that after a little while of certain experiences in life, he knows what his nature is. He calls it his nature because that is the way he is, that is the way he was brought up, and that is the way he has to be, and he cannot change himself because of this and that and so forth, and all kind of arguments come about for himself. Then a person starts to live in accordance with his conscience. But of course there are other things also involved, that he wants to achieve certain things that are desirable for him. And if those things that he wishes, are of a certain kind that after a little while he believes he couldn't live without, then he starts to strtech his conscience a little bit, and sometimes, then, it will go, and then he must have at least something to pacify the conscience, and with that, he tries to reason it out, or what we simply call, rationalizes about whatever he has done, thought, or felt. So in that way a person gradually sharpens his conscience, but sometimes he dulls it. And there are, I'm quite certain, a lot of people for whom conscience doesn't say very much anymore, because the other things have become much more important. How to develope it is a question of seeing what is this extra value involved, and what is really important in a person's life; that is, if one considers that question of having a conscience as beonging to a person in

order to be more responsible, then of course, there is a possibility that a conscience will grow, and will allow certain things or not, but much will depend on the condition in which he lives. And gradually he will take on the coloration of the rest of the people around him in order not to distinguish himself or to be different others, because he can't stand it. There is another thing of course, that is, whenever there is a certain effort involved in wanting to continue to live, gradually people will try to choose the line of least resistence, because I think they are a little lazily inclined, and that sometimes their conscience might require a certain sadrifice, and again their minds will come and try to explain that it really isn't necessary, and that there is a substitute which is just as good, and so forth, and again, this flexibility of the conscience is very unreliable. At times of course, and in a general way, there is a conscience, and totally there is a conscience that is representative of the ordinary rules of society and whatever is the culture that we live in, but for oneself one might draw the line a little narrower and sometimes a little wider. You see, this question of what the conscience is, and when it becomes dependent on how a person is really made, and each person being different from someone else, there is really no absolute conscience; All conscience that we have so far is a subjective one, and when the subjectivity of man is different for each person, of course the conscience has to be different. Now, how to change this, or how to make the conscience more reliable simply means you have to take off and out of it all the different ideas that lead to the subjectivity of one's conscience, and to substitute in its place something that is much more objective, and this time, in the real

sense of the world, that it becomes less and less dependent on personal interpretations. Now of course people have done that in trying not to live in accordance with their own conscience, but tp live in accordance with the conscience of some higher being, sometimes called God or whatever it may be who has prescribed laws in accordance with a religion, and the religion then, having such rules, we call it a dogma, that I then try to live in accordance with what has been prescribed. Therefore the religious societies or sects or whatever it may be certainly have prescribed for the members certain rules of conduct, and that then becomes their conscience, and then the conscience is satisfied when I live in accordance with that, or whatever my interpretation is, and if I don't then I go so-called against my conscience. But in reality I go against the conscience that has been proclaimed for me by alot of other people, and I happen to be a member of that particular group. An objective conscience is one that is universal for all mankind in its most theoretical sense. In order to see then how far it can become non-subjective, I would like to assign it to something that is already objective for me and I call that a higher being, or as if then God could talk to me, and at times, tell me what I should do or not do. Then I introduce to me the voice of my conscience, and sometimes I say I would like to listen to it. Well, many times of course I'm so busy with different things and I don't even hear the voice, and even then if I try to be silent I don't have enough material, and perhaps my conscience is not developed enough to be able to listen to it. You see, we are really at an impasse; we live the best we can ethically; and that perhaps includes being kind and considerate, and not selfish, but then

we run up against other people who are not that way, and then I start to think that they are better perhaps because apparantly, they get more out of the world than I do, and then my conscience might start to object in the first place and after a little while I will say well, the others do it, therefore I can do it, and my conscience is flexible in that sense. Objectively speaking there should be one rule, one rule regarding what is right and wrong, and the only way I can define it is that which is right for me in order to become objective becomes for me good, and that which is opposing the possibility of my becoming objective is evil. Then I have a definite rule, unless I am unclear about what is objective, and the definition for that would be: anything that is non subjective becomes objective, If I could develop some kind of a faculty in myself of that kind of a conscience, I would have a conscience not only objectively speaking for me and with which I could compare whatever thoughts and feelings I might have, but I would be able to develope to such an extent that I could become a guide, so that at any one time when I am really up against it, that then, I would almost say automatically, it starts to function and tells me that this is right and this is wrong. You see, it's a different kind of material from ordinary morality; in that way we call it objective morality. Gurdjieff describes the objective morality as five different parts, or be divided into five different sections or aspects; the first three have to do with the maintainance of the physical body, the maintainamce of the emotional body, and the maintainance of the intellectual body, the fourth has to do with the relation a man has to others, his fellow man, and the

fifth has to do with the, let's say, totality of the management of the universe, of which, then, his endlessness would be the motivating factor, to try to help maintain and perhaps to become of service in the generalities of the management of the world and the universe. Those are the five aspects and I think they are pretty much complete because outside of that, there is really nothing else.

Mr N Yes? (?) Oh, you should study these things before you...

Marcus Demian: I do everytime I get it clear.

Mr N I'm sure that for you it is easy.

Marcus: Not really; it's a multi-question and answer, I think. In the last few meetings you have mentioned on numerous occasions, and although I couldn't put it into words what I felt, it was something more that I felt than what you said, and it's been on my mind about ten days now, that I have thought about it; you told us that we should live on bread and water, that we should pull in our belts. My first impulse...

Mr N Did I, when?

Marcus: On a number of times.

Mr N I have said it would be good every once in a while.

Marcus: Oh, we shouldn't live on it?

Mr N I never said that; as a matter of fact some time agao, I said live on impressions and not on armagnac. Now, we have talked about days of austerity; we have talked about simplicity of life; every once in a while one should have that as an experience, but not all the time. I think it would be quite wrong. I don't think man is made that way.

Marcus I don't think so either.

Mr N So, we agree.

Marcus On that, but this is not the important thing

Mr N No, the important thing is that you must understand what I've said.

Marcus Right.

Mr N So, we're clear now on that then.

Marcus On that level, but this thing I speak of that told me there was something more behind what you said, and I began to ask myself questions and hence, the things I wrote down. One of these questions is this: when you say bread and water, are you talking of a totality that goes beyond a literal meaning of a man picking up a good grain bread and drinking his water, or are you talking on other levels too for those that know and can understand or grasp what you're saying.

Mr N Well, you know bread and water are two material things which I can visualize, and which sometimes I use for feeding. IT is also possible that that simplicity would be sufficient for me to maintain myself, so if you think of it literally, it means simplicity in living, and then bread and water representing that, gradually it becomes a symbol of living as a whole, in general. So then it is not bread and water, but it means simplicity in that which I do, or what I experience or what I am allowed to experience; and then or course it is not a question of digesting a certain kind of food, but then it becomes a question of using energies available for a variety of different functions. You see? So if that and simplicity, and the idea of being simple is now applied to the totality of my life as I know it on earth, then of course I have to have a certain measure that I try to reduce

whatever expenditures I have to the lowest possible level so that I still can maintain myself, fulfill my functions, and at the same time retain aspiration towards something else, These are the three things that are necessary for man; he has to maintain himself at the level where it is sufficient for him to take in food and to use it up for a definite purpose; he has to have energy available for the proper things he is interested in, and not overusing or underusing that energy; and in the third place, he has to have a little extra energy in order to grow, to grow further, and since he is finished as far as his physical appearance is concerned, he has to use this energy for a wish to grow either spiritually or intellectually, or in any event in something which at the present time does not as yet exist, but for which there are the potentialities in him, and that therefore, his use of energy for that kind of purpose whould be subject to the same kind of a law; that is the law that I use just enough in order to do what I want to do and to accomplish a certain task for a purpose. So all this then has to do with the totality of an aim for man for which he has become responsible in the usage of energies or food, which is the same in this case, for the purpose of accomplishing that for which he has set out, and this naturally implies that whatever he happens to think about, that he then has to use the energy for that purpose with enough common sense. Now, sometimes I don't know how much energy is needed; in that case I would watch to see if there is an extra amount or if there is not enough. So simplicity of life is not so easy; many times I have an idea that I need more than I really could digest, in exactly the same way as somtimes I have taste for a good meal, and I know that I am overloading my stomach.

At the same time, if my aim is that man should be born or that he should grow, I have to have a certain quantity of energy for that particular purpose, and not knowing where that growing will lead me, I will not know how much I need, so the simplicity then, is reduced to a period of trial and error in order to find out what is needed and then, with this kind of information, I will establish for myself a principle of living. That is, the conduct of my life becomes dependent on the more and more accumulation of knowledge regarding the necessity of that. But all the time it has to remain simple; it means that certain things I really could do without, but sometimes I think or feel would be necessary and for which I have, I call it a taste. At times I may have to refuse it because it is not necessary, and this is a very difficult thing to know, because as soon as I say I can do without it, I base it upon a hope that I really can do without it. After a little while I may discover that I was too attached to it, and therefore, that my growth has been stunted. If I say I can do with less and less food, less and less sleep, less and less friend and acquaintances, I may at that time deprive myself of a possible development for which I need food but where I could for quite some time do without even knowing that I would reduce the particular level of my health. Now that is why I say it's a question of common sense; whenever I now consider this whole problem of how to live simply and I start to compare it with other people around me, there are very few who will live in accordance with that rule and again I'll be plagued by the idea that someone else is looking at me and will consider me a little strange because I'm so different from the rest. So the requirement of common sense is that whenever I wish to become simple,

I will not show it to anyone else; I will continue to be exactly the same like the Romans are in Rome and to do as all of them. At the same time, that which I need and wish and can do for myself when I am by myself remains my own domain. So the decision then for myself is that I must then know what is right or wrong for me from that standpoint, and that I must not neglect the necessity of continuing having aspiration towards something that I really would wish as an aim for myself. So you see the satisfaction of the first two, that is to find one's place and to maintain it is perhaps not enough for a man to continue to grow, and that his desire for austerity never should interfere with the possibility of the continuation of having I call it aspiration or inspiration. As soon as I know this, I take less and less interest in the possibility of myself continuing to live and to live in that direction or to live with, you might, say, that in mind or in my heart, and that for a little while I may have the semblance of still continuing because there is alot of energy stored up that I can use and on which I can live for quite some time, that I have to be very careful that I know that in reality I'm not the loser but that I can continue, and when I see that I've gone a little bit below the mark, that then I will be strong enough and honest enough to say no, it was not enough. Consider this whole question simply: how much sleep do I need? It is quite definitely an experiment, the possibility of each person finding out for himself how much sleep each person needs, and of course I know it depends a little bit on the activity of the day and how tired I may be, and also it depends on the kind of tired, if it is physical or mental or whatever. Perhaps it is that when I sleep, I am not sleeping deep enough;

I sleep maybe superficially, I sleep maybe in conditions that are not conducive, there is too much noise or maybe there is not enough noise, maybe there is too much silence for me, maybe my state of health is not very conducive to it, and I keep on thinking and worrying about my stomachache, or whatever it may be. But when I consider it for myself, when I start to find out how much I really need, I start at say ten hours and reduce it to eight and then six, five, or I start with two hours and increaseit to three, four, five, until I have found something like an average, and say now, this is enough. Again I will not know until I have maintained it for some time, and then I will know if I get thinner and thinner, or actually have desire to live or not, or that the morning when I get up I still am tired or whatever it may be, because my thought process and the ideas I have about it, and what other people tell me, the fear or the anxiety, all of that enters into a consideration, how much sleep do I really need. It may take some time to experiment to come to a good conclusion, and a conclusion, you might say, that holds water. Well, if the question of sleep is already that difficult, the question of psychological equilibrium is already much more difficult. And if that is a consideration I will hesitate a great deal of introducing too much austerity in the beginning. Simplicity of life is something to aim at, but in order to introduce it, one cannot say, Now I'm going to become austere, and surely not every day. I think very often this whole question should be an aim which one gradually would like to have, and before one can have it, one has to have a taste of a variety of different activities. So really the desire for austerity is based on a realization of the value of

of that which could be my experiences, and that out of that evaluation, I then have something to stand on, that I know I have tasted all things and kept that which is right for me. So I have to have knowledge, I have to acquire experience, I have to allow myself even indulgence in order to find out where is the other limit. Somtimes I've said this question of simplicity is a matter of a carburator; not too much gasoline and not too much air. Well, if I only say not too much gasoline, maybe there is too much air in relation. When it is a question of my life, I play this part, so you see, I must go very slow, and even if the best of intentions or that which I consider to some extent heroic, or perhaps can be proud about, and the great honor that I can tell my grandchildren that I was so marvelous, that I lived from bread and water for two or three months, then they say <u>really</u>? and you say, isn't that wonderful; it was enough to live for that moment. You see what I mean by foolishness? You see what I mean by common sense?

Marcus Yes, I do see. There's one other question next door to this that as you talk comes to mind. You speak of austerity and you speak of the opposite of austerity which is actually the go-ahead to experience or do alot. I have noticed from my experience that I was more mechanical than when I did less things.

<u>Mr N</u> Oh, I believe that. We are now talking about what austerity might give to one; that is, is the state of austerity a desirable one for other purposes? We are talking about how to bring it about; if it can be brought about it can be extremely useful. Perhaps the fact that I am austere or simple, perhaps even simple-minded may mean that at times I resent it, and if I do remember why I want to do it, I can associate that with

waking up. So you see, then I do it for a definite purpose and then the means is justified by the end. It's quite right. At the same time you must realize that at certain times, the question of austerity cannot come up, because in the beginning, and sometimes when there is a great deal of enthusiasm, when there is a great deal of health, when there is really vitality, not only physically, but also emotionally and intellectually, is so tremendous, that there is even a problem of handling it, and that a great deal of energy is simply wasted and falls by the wayside; because I cannot control it, it happens to be there, and it flows through me. It happens to be there because, you might say, of the overproduction which is inherent, and the great vitality of myself as a mechanism. In such a case, it is almost impossible to be austere, and if I try to be austere, I will have a terrible time to keep the excess energy within. For instance if I am bubbling over with enthusiasm or enjoyment or, you might say, with hate, and I try to contain it within myself and not to express it, I will explode, and I cannot help it because the production is so tremendous and so vehement that something in me must go, and it has to be expressed in some form or other. It's quite idiotic at such a time to be austere because the reasons why I happen to be in that kind of state may have been produced by certain factors or influences over which you may have no control. If you tell an apple tree not to have too many blossoms, I think you're a fool.

Marcus Me too.

Mr N And the parable in the Bible of the sower, how much grain falls by the wayside, on the high rocks and on the road, and so forth, and only a very small percentage will really start to

grow and germinate. This is in the beginning of any activity whenever the energy that is avaliable, there is such a push, that it actually because of that enthusiasm, it starts off with a bang, and one will have to learn to find out where it starts to level off. At the point of leveling off and before it starts to go down, that is the point to apply austerity.

Nancy I understand, but now there is one other thing as you talk that comes to mind; you have been speaking about austerity, but not on one level; you have been speaking on austerity on three levels, or on three centers, let us say, the physical, the emotional, and the intellectual. Now how is one to comprehend or to get knowledge about these three centers in terms of austerity or is one to think one is austere emotionally or intellectually because in reality this is not happening.

Mr N The three centers make up a personality; if you look at the behavior form of the personality as a whole, there is of course a certain austerity possible for the personality as it is as a behavior form, but behavior is based on what I think or feel or what I have actively or instinctively engaged in. So if I look at the totality of myself and say I wish to be austere, I have to consider the three parts out of which my personality is made up. Then if I say what is austerety for my mind, you might say I don't want to be overstimulated by certain things that have no particular value, so that I use the mental processes and the energy that is involved in it for all kinds of nonsensical ideas or thoughts that really don't get me anywhere and I would consider a waste of energy. So the austerity applies then to the functioning of intellect and can usually be directed in the sense that where is my interest worthwhile.

Someitmes I say we read too many newspapers, we're interested in certain things like TV, and we sit there and just there and take it in; we're interested in so-called sitting there and being alert with one's eyes and taking in everything and having to formulate it and not letting it go until it actually has a certain name in oneself and all the different things that are intellectually like a super-intellect that are wanting to become very brilliant and bright may use up such an enormous amount of energy which never will yield any particular result for oneself, or whatever the result is, it will not last, and anything that is temporary, now from the standpoint of austerity, is really not very useful. Austerity will mean that I wish to maintain myself in that kind of a state as long as I possibly will live and perhaps forever and ever, so the question of permanancy has to enter somewhere, that I know that that which I now tell my mind to do, that it is permanent enough, that it will continue in that way, and that it is neither wearing out, or that it receives enough oil for the machinery to (?) The same kind of reasoning applies of course to one's feeling center because there are many so-called feelings and emotions that are absolutely useless, where a few not even bother, where a few not have a feeling, where it is something that I know that the energy that I do use is simply spilled into the gutter, it doesn't buy me any bread, it doesn't help me one way or the other in my behavior, it is only a question of occupying my time. Much of that kind of energy that is now emotionally tinted is very cheap, and I am very easily affected by it, by ordinary

forms of sentimentality or so-called charity, or someone who's playing on my heart, or not only my heart strings but surely on my solar plexus strings, and all of that (?). That I simply say now, this is a good man and so forth, and I really am a fool because I'm using this kind of activity of myself for no purpose whatsoever. Someone comes, and you're a good man, and you're an easy mark, and they ask you for a hand out, and there you are next to a girl you want to show off to and you give the man ten dollars. But you see it is utterly silly and foolish. But at the same time, one has to learn, sometimes perhaps learns the hard way. As far as activity of the body is concerned, that which is used as energy is of course for the maintainance of the body much too much, and at certain times, certain parts of the body takes part in that which I think or feel, and sometimes activity as a result of it. But then I use all kinds of muscles in order to, you might say, correlate this particular activity when it isn't necessary. You remember, I lift something up and it requires a certain muscular tension in my arms and my back, and I lift it; at the same time I have a face that is as if...you know, all kinds of things that I believe are necessary when I sit, even in a chair, that it is necessary to maintain myself physically, the tensions in my muscles that are there. And not only that, the use of words, blah, blah, blah, and so forth--sure, it requires energy of the tongue, of your lips and all the rest. You see, much of this physical activity, I'm quite certain, regarding days of austerity, can be reduced to a minimum, and as long as the body is there as a certain medium through which my mind and my feeling can still function, all that is necessary is support. And the question of sup-

port--I use many more muscles than are necessary for support. When I sit, I'm tense, and many times, take for instance your shoulders, everything where your head is and so forth, it is as stiff as a rock, and people don't know about it, and when they find out, they get a haircut, and it is simply because they don't know how to relax. If you remember some of the movements we had when people had to relax, bending down and keeping a certain pace, and you know, a certain rhythm, at the same time, swinging their arms and letting everything go, if you could look at it to see how different people are, and almost how idiotic, sometimes how clowny and sometimes how sad, because their body is absolutely unfit for even doing little things like that. Much of what people in general would call awkwardness is simply due to their body not being flexible enough to be used for certain purposes that it should be used for. Then if you compare that with animals, cats for instance, how relaxed they can be, and little babies, how relaxed they are, how they sleep, and how you cannot understand how they can double up, what happens to us--stiffening of the arteries already, too much crystallization of calcium somewhere, perhaps. And perhaps, thoughts, ideas that it is necessary to be like that, or to have a certain posture that is necessary in order to have a certain impression like someone else. And all the different reasons or feelings that one has all affecting the behavior of the body as it is simply means that the body is doing overwork, using up energy that of course is being used, but quite definitely without any particular reason. I said a little while ago overeating is exactly the same thing; overslee-

ping is a physical question many times. You know the talking machine, that which continues to go on, movements of one's head in different ways, nervous ties of oneself, always looking in shop windows, window shopping, without any idea of wanting to buy it, only to satisfy yourself. Of perhaps you happen to feel a little jealous, or to say how poor I am, what my husband is doing and so on. You understand what I mean? These are the things of course that the total personality is made up of, and if I want to understand myself as a personality, I have to understand what it is that makes a personality as the three component parts, and austerity will help that to enter anyone of the three. Now I think we've said enough about austerity, didn't we?

Bruce Archer I found it interesting, but I'm afraid I felt it was a little disoriented or a little off-balance in the sense that ...maybe it could be filled in if Marcus could indicate or express why it is he's interested in austerity in the first place.

Mr N I don't know. I think He's interested because I mentioned it sometime ago as something that might be useful.

Marcus That helped me, but Mr Nyland, I was interested in it before that, because I came to certain conclusions by myself over a period of time that simplicity was necessary to me not only as an artist but also as a human being, because I found out as a creator, when I became complicated, when I became too much, it wouldn't flow; it became very surface and superficial, and it occurred to me that on this level too, it must be true on all levels. But where does a man, I said to myself, what is a man's austerity in relation to the work; I mean does he go out and flagellate himself or what, and whip himself and suffer,

and eat bread and water, and fast three days and eat one day, and fast two days---I didn't know where I stood in relation to these things, but it had been on my mind because I had done just about everything, I think a person can do in life.

Mr N Really?

Marcus Yes. I think so: travel...

Mr N ...whatever it may be...

Marcus whatever it may be...

Mr N Bruce, is it answered?

Bruce No, it gives a little more indication, but...that's going more in this direction, but I'd like to understand what his interest is in relation to that.

Mr N Well, he explained it. You know, he thought it was necessary because he couldn't do what he wanted to do as an artist, and he thought it was too complicated, so he thought if he could become simpler he would be more artistic, or at least...

Bruce Is that what it is, I don't know.

Mr N Is that it? That is the way I understand it.

Marcus No. On one level, as an artist, as a creator that is true, but also I'm a man, and as a man, my life was too full of what you talked about, nonsense and nonsensical things, things unnecessary for a human being to really live: newspapers. radio, television, whatever the case may be. You understand, (Q-D? And I felt as long as I was trapped by these things and a victim, that is being victimized by my desires that it kept me further from the goal that I was trying to achieve. You understand? So if this was true, then simplicity for me was closer to my goal than the other way, but it's not so easy to become simple

when you've been the other way.

Mr N Does that now satisfy you, Q-D?

Q-D Yes, except that I disagree with him.

Mr N Well, I would almost say thank God you're not Marcus. But I could also say thank God Marcus is not you.

Q-D Well, otherwise we couldn't have the conversation.

Mr N No, each person is different, Q-D; it all depends on what one's bringing up is, and what, at that time you consider austerity, you will allow yourself. And of course when anyone wants to go in that direction, you have to have a definite motivation why you want it.

Q-D No, I felt a distinction between what he was just saying now, and what I felt before that you were indicating as austerity to use in an experimental way, and I got the impression from what he was talking of, was that he wished to understand that or glean something from that as a way of life.

Mr N I think he started out with that as a way of life, and all I've been trying to say is that he should not use that as a way of life, but every once in a while, experimentally to find out what it might give him.

Q-D Well, that's why I asked what kind of conclusion he might have on it.

Mr N Well, he has conclusions on it.

Q-C You know, if it will help you, Q-D, I have one big vice; I mean that; I haven't been able to kick it yet; it's my car.

Mr N What, your what?

Q-C My car.

Mr N Is that a vice?

Q-C To me it is, because I've poured so much into it.

Mr N I mean, having a car is not austere.

Q-C I don't think in New York City it's austere, no.

Mr N Well, you have to come to town when it's important and ... You probably get many tickets.

Q-C Oh, boy.

Mr N Then a car is expensive

Q-C It's more than that.

Mr N Yes, probably it is. Then a person cannot walk anymore; when I was a boy I had to use a bicycle.

Q-C You were lucky.

Mr N Well, of course I didn't pay as much as you pay for a car.

Richard Lipton I'll soon be doing my second reading of ALL AND EVERYTHING; I'd like to know if you could elaborate somewhat on how to read it, how one goes about reading it as if you are reading it to someone else, and whether or not it would be a good idea to have a couple of people come in from time to time and listen and you read to them.

Mr N Well, there are many things involved in it, you know. Have you ever read to someone aloud?

Q-E Yes, but not for any great length of time.

Mr N So, from that standpoint it already would be bad, wouldn't it? The reason for reading it aloud is to be able to formulate certain sounds, that you could hear yourself, and in order to be able to introduce the possibility that hearing myself is different from reading by eyes, so that that which is received when I hear it is going to a different part of the brain as compared to when I just read it with my eyes. The reason for that is--and of course it is a little bit inbetween when you read it by

yourself, which when you read it to others, or when it is being read to you by others, then you have it much more clear. When you read with eyes, you read a sentence, and if you don't understand it, you can go back. Sometimes you read a whole line in one, depending on how you read, but in any event you're not as much pressed as you would be if you have to listen and someone continues to read regardless of your perception. So when that is something that you know you cannot ask the reader to stop every once in a while because you have to catch up in your mind, that therefore you will exert a certain something in your mind wanting to really hear it this time because it is almost the last time you will ever hear it. So that is the difference; one becomes much more alert when one is reading aloud, and that is the reason Gurdjieff says read it aloud even if your voice may be heard by yourself, and even if if when you are reading you still might have the opportunity of hesitating once in a while and going back and forth and at the same time, there is something else set in motion. The other reason is that if one reads aloud to one, to someone else, and of course more so when one is reading for a group of people, also when one belongs to a group and listens to another person, sometimes it is very interesting to visualize when you're alone and you read aloud, someone else as if you are reading. And you take then in your mind someone to whom you would like to read, or with whom you would like to have an opportunity of giving this as your reading to someone else. Then emphasis of the way you want to read you have in mind the other person receiving it; you read it in such a way as to affect the other person for the sake of the other person. So again, something is intro-

duced in one. That it is not just a matter of slipshod reading, but it has to be a matter now of emphasis, and it has to have in mind now the person who will hear it, and then when you hear it, you accomplish something for the other person. So this realization process I think is quite important; at the same time, when you read aloud and you formulate with your voice, you also have a chance because of this extra effort that it is not just a little bit of lip movement, which some people do, but the necessity of having a word come out of you; the effort for the reading itself is much greater.

Q-E So, should one read it in a place where one has to speak aloud?

Mr N Oh, yes.

Q-E In other words it's not much use to read it where you could be overheard.

Mr N I don't think it is necessary to let someone else listen to it, unless you want to read for someone. No. And you should not mumble; you should enunciate, as if you are reading aloud to someone, in a place where nobody is going to judge you or becomes a little suspicious. All right. Go in your own room, close the door and the window.

Q-F Mr Nyland, as you know, last night I received a little reminder; I have to get to work...

Mr N Yes, I remember.

Q-F And this has brought to mind a question I have been wondering about for a long time about a man's destiny. Is there such a thing as destiny or is it something that men have made up?

Mr M No, I don't think it was made up, but it was thought of amd considered, because of a certain necessity on the part of man to put himself in a surrounding in which that which is his life is not all there is to it. To some extent, the thoughts about death are more satisfying if one can have the belief or the assurance that certain things exist which at the present time we are not conscious of, or which cannot be perceived by the eyes, but that I know that I could assume such existence as extra-sensory perception, of certain things that I know must exist in order to give me more satisfaction of my place, where I belong. In that particular ensemble of thoughts, it is also considered that that which happens after one dies remains in existence, and that which is the form of one's life before one is born has been in existence. If this applies to oneself, it should apply to everybody, without any exception. And it would be much more satisfactory to assume that there is a totality of life existing which always will remain in existence, even if at times it takes on a form of someone who is at present time a human being walking around on earth. If this is the case, and as I say, it is a satisfying thought, although it may not be immediately provable, I think there always has been in any person who considers his life and considers it in the line of something that is not only the phenomenon of that which he sees everyday, but when he is thinking of the possibility of the continuation of such an existence, that then it would be very helpful to him to have a certain concept on account of which he could, you might say, populate the rest of the world, and other worlds with something that could remain in existence although not in the form of a human being. That

of course would introduce into a person logically the ideas of a spirit existing, or perhaps ghosts existing as returning to earth, or that somewhere or other, this particular spiritual idea of ectoplasm which again crystallizes out then becomes known. Then also of course this whole idea of the process of reincarnation, the possibility of life hereafter and the return to earth, the necessity of doing certain things in this life for which perhaps life is not long enough and then having the opportunity to continue with that and develope that and then perhaps reach a certain conclusion or at least come to a point where one is satisfied in having fulfilled all one's obligations, and also the idea that when someone dies you don't want to give him up, and that there has to be a belief that perhaps somehow or other, they continue to exist somewhere, and that perhaps, that may be the population of heaven or the idea of hell or purgatory, all these concepts either philosophically or religiously, must come into the mind of a person who is an ordinary human being interested in the possibility of that which does not as yet exist. So I think, based on this, one tries to find out if it is so, based on experimentation, and as far as this clairvoyance or contact with the hereafter, contact with spirits that are already existent, represented by people that have lived before, the whole concept of time, as one gets away from earth, the question of such timelessness, if it does exist, an endlessness in the presence of an omnipresence, an omniscience, and omnipotence, all these things are in line with the concept that everything always has existed and remains

in existence, and that therefore anyone who at the present time experiences certain things which he cannot explain, but for which he to some extent may be grateful, but also realizes that it might have been caused by something that perhaps is protecting him, logically would consider that there was something there, as if that particular presence as a different form from one's material form could exist and be with one and protect one even if I do not know it with my ordinary sense organs. I think that the idea of that and the belief--because I do not always have the proof--but whenever I happen to think about the possibilities of reaching it, and when there is available to me hypnosis or maybe even self-hypnosis, or certain conditions into which there is definitely an insight, and that certain events on earth can be explained very well on the assumption that the possibility of a different kind of world exists outside of this world or perhaps in a form that is not quite as material as this is, the whole idea of spiritual development would lead to the idea of such development not being cut off by one's death, but naturally if one works for that development, then it would be logical to assume that it will remain in existence. You see, all of that belongs to the totality of a field about which we know very little, but we also would be satisfied if somehow or other we would have a much more fervent belief in. With this then one knows and tries to find out, and those people who perhaps are sensitive or those who are media in the real sense of the word, mindreaders or whatever, people who are in contact--or so they say, and one must somehow believe it--because the amount of information they do get is sometimes so astonishing that who can

tell. That there is a possibility of that form of communication completely outside of our mind or our ordinary human quality or organs we have now at the present time, that a person's sensitivity may be quite different from one person to another, and that because of certain things they may be sensitive to certain things to which the average man is not sensitive, that they can receive information that we cannot receive, and that they become then a medium through which that kind of information can grow, and when they can crystallize it and have been, and they will tell you, that they have been in touch with the spirit of your father or grandfather or perhaps, maybe Goethe or some other person who has lived already and as the saying goes has gone over already.

Q-F What about experimentation? You mentioned...

Mr N I am not saying anything about experimentaion to anyone about that kind of a thing. I think it is far better if one wants to find out for oneself to the extent that one dares. If one does it simply on the basis of what another person tells you, and then something happens that you cannot explain and it might upset you, you will blame the other person. I think this kind of affair for oneself is completely personal and it should remain within a person, If he wishes he can assure himself that perhaps it will work out; he can also gather more information soaas to have more certainty for himself, but it is his own affair, exactly the same as is his God his own affiar and no one elses. One can keep on reading, one can keep on studying, one can keep on hearing, one can go to seances if you like, spiritualistic or otherwise. One can believe in extra-sensory perception, and put it on a scientific basis, and see what can

be done with the knowledge that we have at the present time; sometimes one can say LSD can help me in order to help me expand my brain and to be in a little different kind of a state of consciousness. All these things are of course possible and there is no question that they can give one certain information that is not available for the average man. Now if one is sufficiently interested in that, one can do it, provided you use enough common sense so that that which you are doing is not going to be at the expense of your life as you know it. For instance I may be able by a certain form of concentration, sitting quietly and in utter silence, and then believing that it might be possible for me to leave my body, I may go through certain exercises which will enable me to loosen the bondage of that which I might call my spirit, and even the body at certain times, hoping then that it might return. I have heard of course, I have listened to that, I have read about it, and then sometimes it might say, why don't I do it, and perhaps in the beginning I'm a little hesitant, but after some time the urge to do it might be so strong that I actually will do it and try it as an experiment. Again I say it is one's own experiment and one's own responsibility; it should not be done because someone else tells you that it is all right. I would almost say someone else must tell you that it is not all right, and when then still that urge is there, I'm quite certain that is not because a person has put you on to it.

Q-F What aboutnthe question of fluctuation; by that I mean the question of these phenomenon and others like it happening at intervals, and I'm talking about very ordinary things too like

I've noticed that in myself and in other people that there will be short periods of time--well, I'll talk about myself--when I'll be for a few days very clumsy, knocking things over, possibly cutting myself, but ordinarily, cometimes for months at a time, this is not the case; in other words, ordinarily I'm very careful, I don't knock things over, I don't bump into things I don't cut myself...

Mr N Do you want to imply that some kind of a spirit pushes you?

Q-F I don't mean to imply anything.

Mr N Well, what is it then that you wish, because the spirits as such, if they exist, are not always there; that is, they may be close and sometimes not. It is quite possible that a person is living and is absolutely not susceptible to any influence. It may be that the atmosphere around the earth at certain times is not conducive for certain things to exist. To what extent there are bad or evil spirits and good ones, again you might say, a person has to believe in that as a possibility. But if you read enough about folklore, about the different things that do happen and have happened, all the different books, I call them in a general way clairvoyant, whatever it is that the word is being used as the discussion of communication with another world then it is something that hm one has to settle for oneslef, and about which one should not talk too much. The explanation as far as clumsiness is concerned, running into things, it may be dependent on many other factors that are dompletely within your domain and also within your control; I would not immediately assume that it is something from the outside

because I'm afraid that if that is the case and I allow that thought, I will always find an excuse. I think it is probably because one has drunk a little too much, one has slept a little too much, one has worried too much, one is not attentive, one is half asleep; certainly in ordinary life you look where you go and you don't go where you look and soforth. All of that of course can happen to ordinary man, and such phenomena need not be explained on any kind of spiritual or whatever.

Q-F I wasn't looking for any kind of spiritual explanation for it. I was...

Mr N I would not pay attention to it; I would go as long as I possibly can by assuming that it's my ordinary state without introducing anything of any kind of spiritual quality. It just happens to be because you didn't see straight. If it comes without you doing anything about it, like a knocking on the door, or a haunted house, or something where a crime has been committed in some kind of building and that is still visited by someone, you can read all kinds of things, I mention (?) every once in a while; you read it; flying saucers we talked about one time. You see, it all depends how much do I want to believe, and also how much do I know it is reasonable to believe based on certain experiences I have either had myself or to which I was a party. But in a general way stay away from it as long as you possibly can, until some phenomena become so definite for you that you have to give them attention.

Q-G Mr Nyland, I didn't want to bring this up, but it has come up...I want very much to believe in these things, I do, but it's all with my mind. I believe them because I feel them or I

see things from the outside but they're not a part of me.

Mr N Don't be afraid,...

Q-G I'm not afraid...

Mr N Yes, that's right, but now you may want to experience it but you may open yourself up to certain experiences which at the present time you may not be able to digest. That is why I say that a person has to be extremely careful, because we are dealing with something that is not of this world. Whenever anything from another world, high or low is introduced to one, it becomes an abnormal, unnatural condition. You see, whenever I have--have you ever seen a medium, have you ever seen a person operate like that? Well, it would be useful if you did see it; it might clarify for you what takes place, and how such a person at such a time is quite exhausted. If you read the Casey readings and you find out what happened to Casey when he was under that kind of influence, and I think that is sufficiently documented to know that that really did exist and that certain information did reach him, that often the person then being used as a channel is then wearing out. Now there is a certain fascination of course about these things, particularly when it has to do with people who have died; many times--you remember Oliver Lodge and his son during the war of course became that kind of spiritualistic medium. And there are many people who have believed in it; you can pick up a book and if it is a little authentic they will prove it to you.

Q-G But it's more of a nature that I believe there is a divine nature in man.

Mr N Well, it may be so, and I think that it is true that in each person there is something--in some more than in others--

and it might be possible that people are more sensitive and they do have---that you have experienced it for yourself and you are sensitive. How is a person who is clairvoyant and who at the present time may be a medium and uses it, how did they find out originally that they were susceptible to things; they usually had some vision, seeing some things at certain places where other people did not see them. The whole idea of Lourdes, you know, or even Joan of Arc, or sometimes mystical experiences of people, sometimes when they are out in a field and all of a sudden something appears, perhaps built up because of a religious atmosphere and which this child fibbed, but there is certainly on record many things of the appearance of the Virgin Mary, or whatever it may be; Sometimes it is Jesus or as I say, religious things, it can be explained very well. Many of these things that one hears about and reads about, and they are attractive because they are mysterious, particularly when one is sensitive to them, we believe that it might be possible for oneself also to be that kind of receiving apparatus. I say I have no objection to it, and I never would have any fear about it. If it actually is there it would come out and I would not object to it at all, but simply take it for whatever it is, provided I know that whenever I am under that kind of an influence it does not wear me out. But you see, even the experience of say, drinking alcohol would be useful to me, but I'm afraid that if I do too much, it wears, and something is taken away from my ordinary body which still has to function in a certain way. So I'm not excluding experiences at all, but again, experiences belonging to man on earth, as a possiblilty without having to leave his body or to become a sleepwalker--at such things

I would draw the line of let's say, hesitancy. Again I say, it is not necessary to say this is the circle out of which I am not allowed to go--the fascination may be so great that sooner or later I will make the attempt anyhow, but I would go very slow. All right? Keep your sensitivity. It would be one of the first things that would be dulled if one indulges in it too much. That's why one must be careful.

Q-H In SEARCH there is alot of talk about the necessity of a group, and what of us who are going to be out of touch for instance during the next year so that they cannot get to a group.

Mr N Well then, you're out of luck

Q-H What should one do in that case?

Mr N Well, the thing is to find substitutes. Sometimes a person says too bad, I didn't meet Gurdjieff; well, he was out of luck. What does one do? Produce what you can. When you cannot go to meetings, school, or whatever it is, when it isn't there, you will make up your mind that you are not going where you are going, and stay. Or you will say I have to go and then you forego what you cannot do. How to make a substitute for something that really has a value is of course impossible; no substitute is the same as that which might be the experience. How close one can come with a substitute, that it may represent certain principles which are inherent in that which would be the useful experience of being either at a meeting or a school, of course that depends entirely on how much one wishes of it, what can you create, what is it at the present time you think you need, and again, that you don't really need but you would have;

Moreover, how much have you valued the meeting; and this I think is a much more important problem. So that you start to imagine what would it be like without a meeting, and that the meeting, or a group of people at the present time representing something, why was it that you came, and if you did come, what did you get from the fact of a group of people, or form the fact that you were interested in work, in the reading, or in the different things we still could continue without the help of anyone else and without the help of a group. Think about that first; see what it is that motivates you. And then find out what is really necessary for the satisfaction of that which you wish. I think you will have a much clearer idea. Simply the fact thattone leaves a group does not mean that one stops work; it may mean that one has not as fast a progress as one might have in a group, it also might mean that ultimately the group is really neceaaary but that is another point, at which point it becomes necessary, and at whiah point I can have an idea that it is necessary, and really it is not, that I can continue very well on my own for a certain length of time. There are always letters oneecan write to others, there is always information that someone else can give one, what has happened or transpired at a meeting, but all these possibilities, perhaps by hook or by crook, come to a meeting once ina while, perhaps in a blue moon. Who knows, you see? But it is not just a simple question now I am going; what will I do? Not at all. You understand what I mean? Think about it first, and if you come to some conclusion, say Now, this I know I must have. (?) All right?

Q-I In one of Alan Watts' books he states that through first

hand information in speaking to certain Tibetan priests, he discovered that the theory of rebirth that they had told to him was purely symbolical, that each time one had transcended what one was taught through the social environment one had in a sense freed oneself and could then go on towards an objective reality. In Fritz Peter's book, Gurdjieff states that at the end of his wife's life, he was working with her; he said she had been a very old soul, and he was working to in a sense free her from the cycle of rebirth. Now you had just mentioned before that there are certain things one must decide for oneself. However may I ask if Gurdjieff had any definite idea about whether or not the proess of rebirth was symbolical or real?
Mr N Oh, I think it's quite clear that he thought it was real. I think his discussions about the possibility of a soul which then as a soul would continue and then help in the maintainance of the universe, I think it was not symbolical. I'm quite certain it was an actuality of certain things which he had to believe for himself, simply because for his own life there would not be any particular value with just living the way he did and then dying completely. If we think that that was a possibility for him, and I think that it is bourn out by a variety of other kinds of experiences of different other people who have partly left this life and returned to it, that many times there are indications of certain reincarnations in which one has to believe that certain things have happened before, including experiences of one's own, that you know that certain things, it looks as if you already know when sometimes to the letter you could say what is going to be next. I think there are indica-

tions like that more than enough at least to assume that such a possibility exists. I think that when Gurdjieff talks about real I and the development of that, he meant then that there is a will and a conscience besides the consciousness, and that that particular state of individuality and of freedom from his own personality, that at the time when his physical body died, then I'm quite certain that something of Gurdjieff remained in existence. Now to what extent that which remained in existence had fulfilled its purpose and did not need any further, you might say, experience on a certain plane in order to perfect himself--you see, but when he talks about purgatory, when he talks about Kesdjanian body also having a possibility of existence and dying, when he talks about that which is perhaps existing as a Kedjanian or perhaps a soul body again having to enter again into the physical body of someone on earth, you see, one doesn't talk about such concepts unless there is a definite basis for belief or an experience of reality, and one does not say it is only symbolical. At least I would say that that is the way that Gurdjieff might think.

Q-J Mr Nyland I see that how (?) when I am in a movie or watching something, how my eyes would cry or (?) and I really wasn't in it, and contrary to this...

Mr N How you mean you weren't in it?

Q-J In the sense that...

Mr N You look at it, don't you?

Q-J Yes, I could see it crying, but contrary to this, I have been to a doctor some months ago and I needed to be, and I needed to be strapped in the chair. And it wasn't at all that

it hurt me, but I became there aware of that sadness, and...

Mr N Of what?

Q-J A sadnessnthere

Mr N Of what? Why sad? Because someone had to strap you?

Q-J No, it wasn't because of me; I was aware in that particular surgery room of a kind of a sadness.

Mr N Well, it may be. You know sometimes I have a feeling that all of a sudden comes over me; I cannot explain it. It seems to me that it has to do with work.

Q-J Well, just the wish to complete what my (?) was, because it affected me so much. And when I came out from there the nurse said, What a day, What a day; immigrant had to have his blood tested a while ago and he died there. When I wept I did not know that, but it just...I've seen it beofre that I get so affected sometimes in this certain atmosphere.

Mr N It is quite possible; people are sensitive to that. You can be sensitive to that, you can identified with it, when you get bears in your eyes at the movies because you identify with the actors,because you identify with the experience, I think it is a human quality, isn't it? It is something that happens to one because you let it grow and then it is affected and then it starts to react. All the questions of feelings and going over into sentimentality I think are just ordinary human qualities. One can become sad for one reason or another; I don't know but all of a sudden I can be sad; it may that the suffering of the rest of the world all of a sudden happens to come to my mind and I am affected by it. I would not use or think that these are particular examples of an awareness or of being awake. Oversensitivity, sometimes foolishly sensitive, and

sometimes quite uncontrolled; sometimes I think that with tears in one's eyes--it almost becomes automatic--whoever someone says Oh, what? you know and Really--there are tears. You know it is strange sometimes how one reacts to different things or events outside; someone falls on the street and apparantly as a fate or something; my sympathy with that is Oh, poor man. Well, maybe you are strong; but you see, I don't know that, so in me it produces that kind of identification that I immediately appraise myself as if I am the man and it happens to me, or I think that I am his son or his father or whatever and I think that that happens to me in my family, and I am affected in my body in certain places; my blood starts to circulate maybe a little bit more, I become out of breath maybe, or somehow or other I tighten up, a pain appears in my stomach. Only these are ordinary things in ordinary life only to a little bit of an extreme. If one at such a time could be awake, if one happens to think about the possibility of waking up or becoming aware or to be conscious. if at such a time one has enough of a wish to introduce that into the experience on has, that then at that time if I actually am awake, I will not feel, I will not be affected, my body will continue to be affected but I will not be affected, and being awake I, me, I will live in I, not in it. You see, that is the first that has to appear in any form of objectivity, and when that isn't there it is still ordinary life.

Q-J Right. I could see that in the movie, I wasn't really affected, just...

Mr N Oh, yes, I think you were. Oh, I think so, because I would never take that as an example of being awake. I would

almost say you were unconsciously identified. Such things are such habit that even the body takes care of it by seeing things without it having to go through your mind, and that the tears are produced simply as an activity of the body, as an impression you receive, and then of course, you wouldn't even know about it, so it will look as if one is really impartail, and if you arefar from impartial, completely identified; you are so identified that your mind doesn't even take part in it; that's much worse. No, let's not consider these things either important or like something that is a little milestone to consciousness. I think they are events in life or experiences of course and as such things one can say Nice or one can talk about it, or sometimes the experiences are useful, but for the sake of being awake they are of very little use; they really, they don't count. And the sooner I get rid of that, and put these experiences on the basis of the unconscious experience, the better I grow. Because if I start to think that I'm already more than a little bit, and that if something looks a little bit like it, I start to miss what is meant by true awareness and true observation. And as I say, the first that one has to experience is absolute impartiality, and at that time there is no feeling whatsoever; one does not live in it; one lives in I.

It's the end. I said that before, wonderful we have machinery; it tells one to stop. So I'll see you next week I hope. Good night everybody.

END TAPE.